UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/773,755	02/06/2004	Jon W. Lai	ATOMP004	4021
51111 AKA CHAN LI	7590 01/02/200 LP	EXAMINER		
900 LAFAYET		KEMMERLE III, RUSSELL J		
SUITE 710 SANTA CLAR	A, CA 95050	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1791	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/02/2009	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-INBOX@AKACHANLAW.COM

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/773,755	LAI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
RUSSELL J. KEMMERLE III	1791	

	RUSSELL J. KEMMERLE III	1791				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED <u>14 November 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.				
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidaviral (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	which places the r (3) a Request			
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	on.			
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as			
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	iance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be t	filed within two months	s of the date of			
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the				
3. 🛛 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief,	will <u>not</u> be entered be	cause			
(a) ☑ They raise new issues that would require further cor		ΓE below);				
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•					
<ul><li>(c)   ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or</li></ul>	er form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying the	ne issues for			
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims				
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	,	mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			,			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all	-	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the			
non-allowable claim(s).	·	•	-			
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: 32-42 and 59-62.		l be entered and an e	xplanation of			
Claim(s) objected to: <u>31,67-70,72,76,78 and 84-86.</u>						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>21-24,42-58,63-66,73-75,77 and 79-83</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	before or on the date of filing a No	otice of Appeal will not	be entered			
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail	s to provide a			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.						
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		Ž				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:			
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					
	/Mark Halpern/					
	Primary Examiner Art Unit 1791					

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposed amendments raise issues that would require further consideration since they provide new combinations of limitations which have not previously been considered. The proposed addition to claim 21 has not been considered in combination with the other claims dependent from claim 21. Similarly, the limitations of claim 72 proposed to be added to claims 42, 50 and 63 have never been considered in combination with those groups of claims. The amendments to claims 70 and 72 to make them into independent form by incorporating the subject matter of previous claim 66 would require additional consideration as not all limitations of previous claim 66 have been incorporated into the claims, specifically the limitation that the fluid enters the interior only through the first or third opening is not present in proposed claims 70 and 72. These issues would require further consideration to ensure that all such combinations of limitations are fully supported by the specification and to ensure that all requirements (such as under 35 USC 112) are met.